A9330-9F 7/87

THE CONTINUED GROWTH OF HUNGER, HOMELESSNESS AND POVERTY IN AMERICA'S CITIES: 1986

A 25-CITY SURVEY

DECEMBER, 1986

UNITED STATES
CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

Mayor Joseph P. Riley, Jr., President
Mayor of Charleston

Mayor Raymond L. Flynn, Chair
Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness
Mayor of Boston

John J. Gunther, Executive Director

This report was prepared by Lilia M. Reyes and Laura DeKoven Waxman of the U.S. Conference of Mayors staff. Additional copies are available for $10 each from Elynor Humber, U.S. Conference of Mayors, 1620 Eye Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006, (202)293-7330.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY 1

INTRODUCTION 5

HUNGER 7

HOMELESSNESS 15

HOUSING 29

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS 33

APPENDIX

Characteristics of Survey Cities

Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness
Information Sheet

Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness

SUMMARY

To assess the current status of hunger, homelessness and poverty in cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors surveyed 25 of the cities whose mayors are members of its Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness. The survey sought information on 1) the demand for emergency food assistance and emergency shelter and the capacity of local agencies to meet that demand; 2) the causes of hunger and homelessness and the demographics of the populations; 3) the status of housing affordable by low income people, a key factor in the increasing incidence of homelessness; 4) economic conditions relating to poverty and unemployment; 5) the impact of the national economic recovery on these problems; and 6) the outlook for these problems in 1987.

HUNGER

- The demand for emergency food assistance increased by one-fourth during 1986 in 88 percent (all but three) of the survey cities. The number of families with children requesting assistance increased in four out of five of the survey cities, by an average of 24 percent.

- An average of 23 percent of the demand for emergency food assistance currently goes unmet in the survey cities. In well over half of the responding cities, emergency food assistance facilities must turn away people in need because of lack of resources.

- Twenty-one of the survey cities (84 percent) expect the demand for emergency food assistance to increase during 1987; three expect it to remain the same, and one expects it to decrease.

- Unemployment, inadequate benefit levels in public assistance programs, and poverty lead the list of causes of hunger in the survey cities. Other causes cited by some of the cities include the lack of affordable housing, problems with the food stamp program and a changing economy.

- Eighty-four percent of the survey cities use city government funds -- either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants -- to support local emergency food assistance efforts. Forty-four percent of the survey cities use locally generated revenues, 32 percent use state grants, and 76 percent use federal funds.

HOMELESSNESS

- In every survey city save one the demand for emergency shelter increased during 1986; the average increase was 20 percent. The demand did not decrease in any of the cities.

- An average of 24 percent of the demand for emergency shelter in the survey cities goes unmet. In 72 percent of the cities emergency shelters must turn away people in need because of lack of resources.

- Homelessness is expected to continue to increase in 84 percent of the survey cities during 1987.

- The causes of homelessness most frequently identified by the survey cities are the lack of housing affordable by low-income people, unemployment and other employment-related problems, and mental illness and the lack of services needed by mentally ill persons. Other major causes include the high incidence of poverty and other economic problems, substance abuse and the lack of needed services, problems with income maintenance programs, domestic violence and population shifts.

- On average, the composition of the cities' homeless population is 56 percent single men, 28 percent families with children, and 15 percent single women. An average of 29 percent of the homeless in the responding cities are chronically mentally ill; nearly one in five are employed, in either full-time or part-time jobs.

- By far, the most significant change in the cities' homeless population has been in the number of families with children, with four out of five of the survey cities reporting that the number of families with children seeking emergency shelter has grown. In seventy-two percent of the cities, families comprise the largest group for whom emergency shelter and other needed services are particularly lacking.

- Just over three-fourths of the survey cities use city government funds to support local shelters or other services for homeless people. Sixty percent of the cities use locally generated revenues for this purpose, just over half use state grants, and two-thirds use federal grants.

HOUSING

- During 1986 the demand for assisted housing by low-income households increased in all but three of the survey cities, by an average of 40 percent. In none of the cities did it decrease.

- The average wait for assisted housing in the survey cities is 18 months; waiting lists for assisted housing have been closed in 68 percent of the cities. Less than one-third of the eligible low-income households are currently being served by assisted housing in the survey cities.

- Over the last five years the safe, decent and affordable housing stock available to low and moderate income households decreased in over half of the survey cities, increased in 29 percent and remained the same in 17 percent. None of the survey cities expect to be able to meet rental housing needs, given the decline in federally assisted housing programs.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

- Over two out of three of the survey cities reported that the number of poor people increased during 1986. Two cities reported decreases in the number of poor people; five said the number remained the same.

- The unemployment situation improved in 42 percent of the responding cities, remained the same in another 42 percent and worsened in four cities.

- While 61 percent of the responding cities said that they had benefited from the national economic recovery, nearly nine out of 10 of the cities said the recovery has not helped the hungry, the homeless or other low-income people in their city. In the three cities where the economic recovery has helped the poor, that help has been indirect, through increased charitable giving and availability of services.

INTRODUCTION

In October, 1982 the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the U.S. Conference of City Human Services Officials brought the shortage of emergency services -- food, shelter, medical care, income assistance, energy assistance -- to national attention through a 55-city survey. That survey showed that the demand for emergency services had increased in cities across the nation, and that on average only 43 percent of that demand was being met.

Since that time the Conference has done numerous reports on hunger, homelessness and poverty in cities. These reports have documented the causes and magnitude of the problems, how cities were responding to them and what national responses were required. They include:

- Hunger in American Cities, June, 1983
- Responses to Urban Hunger, October, 1983
- Status Report: Emergency Food, Shelter and Energy Programs in 20 Cities, January, 1984
- Homelessness in America' Cities: Ten Case Studies, June, 1984
- Housing Needs and Conditions in America's Cities, June 1984
- The Urban Poor and the Economic Recovery, September, 1984
- The Status of Hunger in Cities, April, 1985
- Health Care for the Homeless: A 40-City Review, April, 1985
- The Growth of Hunger, Homelessness and Poverty in America's Cities in 1985: A 25-City Survey, January, 1986
- Responding to Homelessness in America's Cities, June, 1986

To spearhead the Conference's efforts to respond to the emergency services crisis in cities, the President of the Conference of Mayors appointed 20 mayors to a Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness in September, 1983. That Task Force is now chaired by Boston Mayor Raymond L. Flynn, and the number of mayors serving on it has increased to 28. The Task Force meets at least twice each year; many of its members have testified before Congress; and the cities represented on it have provided information to Conference staff on conditions relating to hunger and homelessness for the various reports that have been prepared.

This report provides information on the current status of hunger, homelessness and the conditions which have affected them in 25 of the cities represented on the Task Force. It is made possible by a grant from the American Can Company Foundation. The data were collected from the cities during November and December, 1986.

HUNGER

The demand for emergency food assistance in general, and by families and the elderly in particular, increased in at least four out of five of the survey cities, by an overall average of 25 percent. The capacity of emergency food assistance facilities increased in 52 percent of the survey cities, by an average of 23 percent. An average of 23 percent of the need for emergency food assistance goes unmet in these cities, and in well over half of the cities people are turned away because of lack of resources. The demand for emergency food assistance is expected to increase further in 84 percent of the cities during 1987.

THE DEMAND

The demand for emergency food assistance increased in all but three, or 88 percent, of the survey cities. The average amount of the increase was 25 percent, ranging from four percent in San Antonio and five percent in Cleveland and Yonkers to 50 percent in Charleston, 55 percent in Denver and 100 percent in Trenton. Officials in Minneapolis and Norfolk reported that the demand remained the same. Kansas City reported an overall decrease of 10 percent, but noted that the decrease occurred in the first six months of 1986, and that since then "there has been a slow, but steady increase in the demand for emergency food assistance."

The number of families with children requesting emergency food assistance increased in 80 percent of the survey cities. It remained the same in five cities: Cleveland, Kansas City, Minneapolis, Norfolk and Trenton. No cities reported a decrease in the number of families requesting assistance. The average amount of the increase was 24 percent, ranging from four percent in San Antonio, 10 in Nashville and Yonkers and 11 in Chicago to 60 percent in New Orleans and 70 percent in Denver.

There was an increased number of elderly persons requesting emergency food assistance in 81 percent of the responding cities. Four cities -- Cleveland, Hartford, Minneapolis and San Antonio -- reported that the number of elderly persons requesting assistance remained the same. None reported a decrease. The average amount of the increase was 17 percent, ranging from five percent in Norfolk, Seattle and Yonkers to 35 percent in Detroit and 64 percent in Denver.

THE CAPACITY

The number of emergency food assistance facilities in the survey cities increased in 13 cities, or 52 percent. These cities are Charleston, Cleveland, Denver, Hartford, Los Angeles, Louisville, New Orleans, New York City, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, San Juan and Seattle. The average amount of the increase was 23 percent. The number of facilities decreased in three cities -- Detroit, San Antonio and Trenton -- by an average of eight percent. It stayed the same during 1986 in nine cities -- Boston, Chicago,

Kansas City, Minneapolis, Nashville, Norfolk, Salt Lake City, San Francisco and Yonkers.

Commenting on the decrease in the capacity of emergency food assistance facilities, Detroit officials said:

> "Emergency food providers generally indicate a sharp decline in contributions. Many of those working in emergency feeding operations have expressed frustration. Organizations which subsist on volunteers to operate and contributions to sustain a level of service are having difficulty responding to the number of persons who need help. All of them say that they could easily serve more people if they had more food and more staff. Increased utility costs and other overhead costs have also contributed to the fact that some emergency food providers are cutting back on the number of days they are open."

Fourteen cities reported that emergency food assistance facilities are used for emergencies only: Boston, Charleston, Cleveland, Detroit, Hartford, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Nashville, New Orleans, Phoenix, Portland, Salt Lake City San Antonio, and San Juan. Nineteen said they are used as a steady source of food for a long time: Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Hartford, Los Angeles, Louisville, Minneapolis, New Orleans, New York City, Norfolk, Portland, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, San Juan, Seattle, Trenton and Yonkers. Nine of these cities reported that emergency food assistance facilities are used both for emergencies and as a steady source of food.

THE FUNDING

Twenty-one of the survey cities have used city government funds (either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants) to support local emergency food assistance. The funds come from a variety of sources:

- Twelve cities use locally generated revenues: Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Detroit, Louisville, Nashville, New York City, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, Salt Lake City and San Francisco.

- Eight cities use state grants: Chicago, Detroit, Minneapolis, New York City, Philadelphia, Portland, Salt Lake City and Seattle.

- Federal funds are used in 19 cities: Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Hartford, Los Angeles, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, New Orleans, New York City, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, Salt Lake City, San Antonio and Seattle. Of these:

  * Four cities -- Charleston, Cleveland, Nashville and Seattle -- use General Revenue Sharing.

  * Community Development Block Grant is used by nine: Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Los Angeles, Louisville, Portland, Salt Lake City and Seattle.

* Eleven cities use the Community Services Block Grant: Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, Phoenix, Portland, Salt Lake City, San Antonio and San Francisco.

* The Emergency Food and Shelter Program administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency is used by 20 cities: Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Hartford, Los Angeles, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, New Orleans, New York City, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Portland, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, San Francisco, and Seattle.

Among the other sources of support listed are private funds, the United Way, the WIC program, and U.S. Department of Agriculture surplus commodities.

THE UNMET NEED

An average of 23 percent of the demand for emergency food assistance in the survey cities goes unmet. The unmet need ranges from five percent in Louisville and San Antonio to 40-45 percent in Denver, 75 percent in Trenton and 97 percent in San Juan. Minneapolis, New York and Philadelphia report that none of the demand goes unmet.

Thirteen cities reported that emergency food assistance facilities must turn away people in need because of lack of resources. The two reasons most frequently cited for this are inadequate supplies of food and insufficient staff. Among the comments from the city officials:

Boston: "Because of the great demand for food, programs run out of food and out of funds. Further, programs lack transportation to and from food sources (the food bank, wholesale outlets and donors). Programs especially lack high nutrition foods, which are in short supply at the food bank."

Charleston: "The soup kitchens seem to be able to keep up, but the agencies providing pantry assistance frequently run out."

Denver: "There are no 24-hour facilities, and 20 percent of the calls come after operating hours."

Kansas City: "Resources are being stretched to their utmost limits, as evidenced by the fact that one-third of the local pantries are providing less than a three-day supply of food."

New Orleans: "Many of the emergency food assistance facilities that were able in the past to meet the demand now have to turn people away because the demand is so much greater."

Salt Lake City: "Routinely there are staffing problems in keeping facilities open. Occasionally, there is a shortage of food."

San Francisco: "The number of feeding sites has not increased, but the number of persons needing such services has."

Seattle: "The amount of food available from food distributors does not allow food banks to provide several days worth of nutritious meals. Consequently, people must go to several food banks."

Trenton: "In most cases getting food is not a great problem, but due to staffing and funding inadequacies many programs have limited capability to serve, even if food commodities are plentiful. We are forced to rely on volunteers to meet a continuing and growing problem."

Ten cities reported that emergency food assistance facilities do not have to turn people away due to lack of resources. But some still report difficulties in meeting the need:

San Antonio: "The quantities of food distributed to those in need has increased every year since 1983. The demand, however, simply exceeds the resources available. People receive some food, but not necessarily of sufficient quality or quantity."

Yonkers: "The problem is more one of reaching the people in need of help to convince them that help is available and to overcome their fear of being helped."

Two cities which were unable to estimate the percent of the demand which goes unmet explained why: Cleveland officials commented that 87 percent of the clients interviewed by one provider felt that they needed food at least once a month, rather than once every two months. Similarly in Seattle, most food banks attempt to give people something, whether just some canned goods or a loaf of bread. City officials conclude, therefore, that "it is difficult to measure the need for emergency food which goes unmet."

THE CAUSES

Unemployment, inadequate benefit levels in public assistance programs and poverty lead the list of causes of hunger in the survey cities.

- Fifteen cities cited unemployment or other employment-related problems: Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Hartford, Louisville, Nashville, New Orleans, New York City, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland San Antonio and San Juan. Louisville and Nashville specifically saw low salary levels as a contributing factor. New York City mentioned the problems of the working poor.

- Inadequate levels of public assistance was indentified as a contributing factor in 11 of the cities: Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Louisville, Nashville, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Seattle and Trenton. Louisville officials explained: "The AFDC grant level for a family of four has risen only $11 over the last ten years, from $235 per month to $246 per month for a family of four. At the same time, the inflation rate rose by 93 percent, effectively cutting the purchasing power of the AFDC grant in half." In Seattle "public assistance and food stamp allotments have not adequately kept up with inflation. Cash assistance grants simply do not meet housing, utility and food expenses."

- Six cities cited poverty: Boston, Hartford, Los Angeles, New York City, Philadelphia and San Antonio.

Other causes identified for the problem of hunger were:

- The lack of affordable housing -- by Boston, Nashville, Trenton and Yonkers. According to Yonkers officials: "Hunger is simply a symptom of a greater problem which is the lack of affordable housing. Money for food goes to pay housing costs which are excessive."

- Problems with the food stamp program -- by Detroit, Kansas City, New Orleans and Salt Lake City. Kansas City officials explained: "Most of the local problems could be alleviated by a more responsive food stamp program. Most people report a considerable delay in the state's system for processing applications for food stamps and AFDC. Approximately 80 pecent of the people who seek food assistance through the emergency food pantry systems have applied for or are receiving food stamps."

- A changing economy -- by Cleveland and Louisville.

Additional causes cited by the cities were substance abuse, mental and physical disabilities, poor access to supermarkets, difficulties in accessing income assistance programs, and a variety of family-related problems, such as teenage pregnancy, family break-ups, domestic violence and child abuse.

THE OUTLOOK

Twenty-one of the survey cities -- 84 percent -- expect the demand for emergency food assistance to increase during 1987. The reasons given by the city officials for the expected increase are often complex:

Boston: "Housing costs are expected to continue escalating; growth in the state economy shows signs of slowing down; the jobs available to unskilled workers aren't sufficient to feed their families; public assistance benefits are expected to remain inadequate."

Charleston: "There has been a steady increase for the last few years. Nothing in particular has happened to indicate that change is imminent."

Detroit: "If benefit levels stay the same or are further reduced, the demand for emergency assistance will increase as living costs rise. We must also be concerned with employment opportunities; recently announced cutbacks and closings by General Motors will impact upon nearly 6,000 Detroit metropolitan area workers in 1987."

Louisville: "Individuals and families are going to continue to be unable to meet their basic needs of food, shelter and clothing."

Nashville: "Despite a booming economy and low unemployment rate, many remain outside the economic mainstream, such as the elderly on low,

fixed incomes, single parents with young children on AFDC, unemployable adults and others."

New York City: "The level of unemployment among this population has remained very high and cutbacks in federal assistance programs will exacerbate this problem. The city's food and hunger hotline has been receiving an increasing number of calls."

Phoenix: "There is much more need, particularly among families."

Portland: "The city's economic picture is very poor, and economic conditions are not expected to improve."

Salt Lake City: "The demand has consistently increased during 1985 and 1986, and there is no reason to expect that it will subside in the near future."

San Antonio: "If the economic situtation remains the same or worsens, then the demand is anticipated to increase."

San Francisco: We "expect an increase due to continued unemployment and the high cost of living. Most 'low cost' housing (usually SRO's) units don't have food preparation facilities."

Trenton: "Little is being done to increase benefit levels. Funding initiatives on all levels are poorly designed to respond to the varying populations...with special needs."

Hartford, Minneapolis and Norfolk all expect the demand for emergency food assistance to remain at the current level during 1987. Yonkers reports: "It will decrease if plans for new initiatives of affordable housing construction proceed. If not, then it will increase."

CITY DATA ON HUNGER

CITY	PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN DEMAND FOR EMERGENCY FOOD IN 1986	PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN IN 1986	PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN ELDERLY IN 1986	NUMBER OF EMERGENCY FOOD FACILITIES IN 1986	PERCENTAGE OF UNMET NEED	ARE PEOPLE TURNED AWAY? YES	ARE PEOPLE TURNED AWAY? NO	DEMAND FOR EMEGENCY FOOD IN 1987
BOSTON	18	18	10	same	10-15	x		increase
CHARLESTON	50	--	--	increased	--	x		increase
CHICAGO	11	11	11	same	14		x	increase
CLEVELAND	5	--	--	increased	--	x		increase
DENVER	55	70	64	increased	40-45	x		increase
DETROIT	--	30	35	decreased	35-40	x		increase
HARTFORD	10	--	--	increased	--	x		same
KANSAS CITY	-10	--	--	same	10	x		increase
LOS ANGELES	--	--	--	increased	16	x		increase
LOUISVILLE	15	15	20	increased	5		x	increase
MINNEAPOLIS	--	--	--	same	0		x	same
NASHVILLE	10	10	10	same	9	x		increase
NEW ORLEANS	20	60	--	increased	35	x		increase
NEW YORK CITY	29	--	13	increased	0		x	increase
NORFOLK	--	--	5	same	--		x	same
PHILADELPHIA	35	--	--	increased	0		x	increase
PHOENIX	--	--	--	increased	25		x	increase
PORTLAND	24	24	24	--	--	--	--	increase
SALT LAKE CITY	34	21	16	same	20	x		increase
SAN ANTONIO	4	4	--	decreased	5	x		increase
SAN FRANCISCO	20	12	12	same	--	x		increase
SAN JUAN	--	--	--	increased	97	x		increase
SEATTLE	10	26	5	increase	--	x		increase
TRENTON	100	--	10	decreased	75	x		increase
YONKERS	5	10	5	same	15		x	decrease

HOMELESSNESS

The demand for emergency shelter increased in 96 percent of the survey cities during 1986 and is expected to continue to increase during 1987. The number of families with children requesting emergency shelter increased in 92 percent of the cities. By far, the most significant change in the cities' homeless population has been a growing number of families with children, with 80 percent of the cities reporting an increase among this group. In 72 percent of the survey cities shelters must turn away people in need because of lack of resources. Often those people are members of families. Families comprise the largest group for whom emergency shelter and other needed services are particularly lacking in over 70 percent of the cities.

THE DEMAND FOR EMERGENCY SHELTER

During 1986 the demand for emergency shelter increased in 96 percent of the cities. The average increase was 20 percent. In none of the cities did the demand decrease; one city -- Kansas City -- reported no change. Los Angeles reported the highest rate of increase, 50 percent, followed by Minneapolis with 30 percent; New Orleans, Philadelphia, Phoenix, and Seattle, with 25 percent; and Denver and Salt Lake City with 20 percent. Increases of less than 20 percent were reported by Chicago, Cleveland, Norfolk, Portland, San Antonio, San Francisco, Trenton and Yonkers.

In all but two of the cities (92 percent) the number of families with children requesting emergency shelter increased in 1986. The average increase in the number of families requesting assistance was 22 percent. This ranged from 46 percent in Louisville, 40 percent in Detroit, 30 percent in Los Angeles and Seattle, and 20 percent in New York City, Norfolk, San Francisco and Trenton, to five percent in San Antonio. Two cities -- Minneapolis and Hartford -- reported no change. The number of families requesting emergency shelter did not decrease in any of the cities during 1986.

THE POPULATION

The composition of the homeless population in the survey cities varies significantly. On average, however, single men comprise 56 percent of homeless persons in the cities, 28 percent are families with children, and 15 percent are single women. Charleston and Minneapolis have the largest percentage of single men among their homeless population -- 85 percent -- followed by New Orleans with 77 percent; Hartford, Louisville, Norfolk and San Antonio with 75 percent; and Salt Lake City with 70 percent. Other cities where single men account for half or more of the homeless people are Boston, Cleveland, Norfolk and Seattle.

Families with children comprise 76 percent of the homeless population in New York City. In Portland, 52 percent of the 9,256 people who were served by the Emergency Housing Voucher Program last year were families

with children. Half of the people who are homeless in Philadelphia, Trenton and Yonkers are families. Families with children constitute 40 percent of the homeless people in Chicago and Kansas City, and 35 percent of the homeless in Seattle. Other cities where families comprise twenty percent or more of the homeless population are Boston, Cleveland, Denver, Phoenix, Salt Lake City, and San Francisco.

On average, single women comprise 15 percent of the homeless population in the responding cities. Estimates range from three percent in New York City to 35 to 40 percent in Denver. Charleston, Hartford, Louisville, Minneapolis, Norfolk, Phoenix, Portland, Salt Lake City and Seattle all reported that single women make up approximately 10 percent of the homeless population.

An average of 29 percent of the homeless persons in the responding cities are considered to be chronically mentally ill, ranging from 60 percent in Louisville, 45 percent in Salt Lake City and San Francisco and 40 percent in Charleston, Minneapolis and Seattle, to 15 percent in Trenton and two percent in Yonkers. Los Angeles officials reported that 14 percent of the homeless in the city are mentally ill; 22 percent of those in the Skid Row area have chronic mental illness.

Substance abusers also comprise an average of 29 percent of the homeless population in the responding cities. Estimates range from two percent in Yonkers to 70 percent in Louisville. Other cities that reported significant percentages of substance abusers among their homeless population include Hartford and Minneapolis (50 percent), San Francisco (45 percent), and Charleston, Chicago and Seattle (40 percent). Los Angeles indicated that 30 percent of the homeless people in the city and 46 percent of those in the Skid Row area are substance abusers.

An average of 19 percent of the homeless people in the responding cities are employed, in either full-time or part-time jobs. Estimates of the percentage of homeless people who are working range from five percent in Norfolk and Philadelphia to 33 percent in Charleston. Chicago, Kansas City, Seattle and Yonkers all reported that approximately 30 percent of the homeless are employed. Other cities where twenty percent or more of the nomeless have some type of employment include Louisville, Salt Lake City and Trenton. In Boston 10 percent of the adults who are members of homeless families and 25 percent of homeless single adults have jobs.

CHANGES IN THE HOMELESS POPULATION

All twenty-five cities surveyed indicated that the characteristics of their homeless population has changed in recent years. The most significant difference has been a growing number of families with children, with 80 percent of the cities reporting an increase among this group. Six cities -- Cleveland, Detroit, Denver, Portland, Seattle and Yonkers -- specifically mentioned an increase in the number of women with children who are homeless. Among the comments from the city officials:

> Boston: "The percentage of children among the homeless population has increased from 5 percent to 13 percent since 1983."

Chicago: "There are more homeless families with children. More families are breaking dowr due to unemployment, stress and abuse, and are requesting shelter from the City."

Phoenix: "We are seeing more homeless families than ever before."

Philadelphia: "The single most significant change has been the unwavering increase each year in the number of families who are homeless. We are approaching a point at which almost 50 percent of the persons in shelters are families with children -- a horrifying statistic."

Other cities with increasing numbers of homeless families are Charleston, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Nashville, New Orleans, Norfolk, San Francisco, San Antonio, Salt Lake City, and Trenton.

Thirty-six percent of the responding cities indicated that their homeless population includes greater numbers of young single adults. In Detroit, the median age of homeless individuals is 35. Louisville officials reported that the number of young males between the ages of 18 and 25 who are homeless has grown rapidly. This age group, which has become "the hard core unemployed in the community," constitutes a large percentage of the city's homeless population. In Portland there are greater numbers of young homeless men who lack any type of job skills. Many of these individuals carry weapons and are considered to be violent. San Juan officials indicated that the city's homeless population now includes more young adults because of high levels of unemployment and a high incidence of mental illness among this group. Other cities which reported more young single adults among the homeless are Charleston, Kansas City and New Orleans.

Greater numbers of single women among the homeless were reported by 28 percent of the cities. In Louisville the number of middle aged women who are homeless has grown significantly due primarily to divorce, lack of job skills among this group, and the release of many female patients from state mental hospitals. San Francisco officials reported an increase in the number of single women, "particularly those with mental health problems." Other cities which reported growing numbers of homeless single women are Charleston, Los Angeles, Salt Lake City, San Antonio and Seattle.

Five cities -- Los Angeles, New Orleans, Salt Lake City, San Francisco and San Juan -- mentioned that their homeless population now includes more chronically mentally ill individuals. New Orleans specifically attributes this increase to the closing of state mental health facilities.

Several other changes in the homeless population were reported by the survey cities:

- In Yonkers, "there has been a marked increase in the number of homeless working poor, especially single parent households with a full-time job who simply cannot afford housing which has been priced out of their range of affordability."

- Increasing numbers of dislocated workers who are now homeless were reported by New Orleans and Los Angeles. In New Orleans many of the homeless "would-be working had they not lost their jobs as a result of declines in the oil and gas industry."

- More homeless youths are seen in Los Angeles and Seattle.

- In Seattle, "the numbers of persons with alcohol and drug problems who are homeless have drastically increased."

- In Los Angeles there are more Hispanics, primarily recent immigrants, among the homeless. Minneapolis officials report "an influx of Black and Hispanic persons (some White) from other cities" who now find themselves homeless.

THE CAUSES

The causes of the growing problem of homelessness in cities are many and complex. Those most frequently identified by the cities are the lack of housing affordable by low-income people, unemployment and other employment related problems, and mental illness and lack of services needed by mentally ill persons. Other major causes of homelessness include a high incidence of poverty and other economic problems, problems with income maintenance programs, substance abuse and lack of needed services, population shifts, and domestic violence.

Lack of Low-Cost Housing

Nineteen, or 76 percent, of the survey cities identified the lack of affordable housing as a main cause of homelessness. Among those cities are Boston, Chicago, Charleston, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Louisville, Nashville, New Orleans, Phoenix, San Juan and Trenton. Salt Lake City officials indicated that "the cost of housing has significantly increased in recent years; many low-cost housing units and SRO's have been demolished." "Lack of new housing construction in the rental range affordable to low and moderate income residents and the loss of existing affordable housing either through condemnation or gentrification" are considered to be the principal causes of homelessness in Yonkers. Officials in Trenton stated: "It is important to note that the demand for shelter has not increased as much as the demand for housing. People are stuck in a housing crisis."

Unemployment

Sixty-four percent of the cities indicated that unemployment and other employment related problems were major causes of the problem of homelessness. Half of those cities -- Charleston, Hartford, Kansas City, Nashville, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, and San Francisco -- specifically mentioned the lack of unskilled jobs. San Francisco officials noted there is a "shortage of 'blue collar,' non-technical jobs" in the city. In Kansas City the problem of unemployment "has been exacerbated by a decline in unskilled jobs." There are limited opportunities for unskilled workers in Phoenix's high technology labor market. Low levels of literacy and job skills contribute significantly to the problem of homelessness in Nashville, according to officials from that city.

Mental Illness/Lack of Needed Services

Mental illness combined with the lack of services needed by mentally ill individuals was identified as a cause of homelessness in over half (56 percent) of the cities. These cities include Boston, Charleston, Kansas City, Louisville, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, San Juan and Trenton. San Juan officials indicated there are no adequate mental health facilities in the city; officials in Charleston report there is a lack of transitional housing for mentally ill persons in the community. "Lack of suitable living arrangements and services for persons released from mental (and penal) institutions" is considered a major cause of the problem in Nashville. San Francisco officials noted that "mental health treatment monies have never followed the patient released from the state hospitals." Officials in Seattle reported that "the state's mental health system has forced many chronically mentally ill people into communities where they have a difficult time adjusting to an increasingly competitive job market and stable living conditions." Trenton officials sum up the situation: "In most cases the lack of comprehensive support systems for the mentally disabled living in the community has created a new and vulnerable sub-class in many urban neighborhoods."

Substance Abuse/Lack of Needed Services

Substance abuse, primarily alcoholism, combined with the lack of needed services was identified as a cause of homelessness by nine, or 36 percent, of the survey cities: Charleston, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, San Francisco and Seattle. San Francisco officials noted that "cutbacks in federal subsidies for substance abuse treatment programs have not permitted any expansion of those services to an ever-growing population of substance abusers who are also homeless." Louisville officials also identified cuts in drug and alcohol abuse programs as a contributing factor. The lack of "integrated housing/treatment programs" and institutional services for substance abusers was identified as a cause of homelessness in Philadelphia.

Population Shifts

Another nine cities indicated that population shifts resulting from migration into the city from other areas had contributed to the problem of homelessness. They include Hartford, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Phoenix, Salt Lake City, San Antonio and San Juan. In Kansas City there has been an influx of displaced farmers from surrounding rural communities, many of whom are homeless. Phoenix continues to experience an influx of people from other regions seeking a temperate climate and jobs. Many of them, however, find that they do not have the skills needed to compete in the city's high-tech labor market. In Salt Lake City -- "the Crossroads of the Intermountain West" -- many of the city's homeless are people who have migrated from other areas of the country, or from nearby cities where there are no facilities for the homeless. Officials in Nashville stated: "We are seeing an increase in the number of migrants who are attracted by the 'boom-town' conditions in this region. Many of them arrive without the necessary resources." In San Juan an influx of people moving to the metropolitan area from other parts of the island or through illegal immigration has contributed to the growing problem of homelessness.

Inadequate Income Maintenance Programs

Eight cities (32 percent) specifically mentioned problems with income maintenance programs, primarily low levels of assistance which are not sufficient to meet the high cost of living. Officials in Seattle reported that "welfare benefits in the State of Washington are set at only 65 percent of the minimum budget needed by a low-income family." Chicago indicated that "the inability of many families to make ends meet by budgeting inadequate public assistance contributes to the problem of homelessness." Officials in San Francisco noted that "benefits are not of sufficient levels to last the whole month." According to Detroit officials, "the Wayne County Department of Social Services indicates that the average rental unit is estimated to be around $322. The average rent actually paid by a typical three-person AFDC family is about $194. On average, only 72 percent of the rent obligation is covered by the social service allotment of $140." Other cities which cited problems related to income maintenance programs include Kansas City, Los Angeles, Louisville, Norfolk and Philadelphia.

Economic Factors

Seven cities (28 percent) cited economic factors, such as inadequate income, high incidence of poverty and a high cost of living as principal causes of homelessness. Among those cities are Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, Norfolk, Nashville and San Francisco. According to San Francisco officials, "fixed and low incomes have not kept pace with increasing costs of living -- the cost of living in San Francisco is one of the highest in the country."

Domestic Violence

Six cities -- Cleveland, Detroit, Kansas City, Nashville, Portland and Seattle -- identified domestic violence as a major cause of homelessness. Officials in Seattle reported that "the problems of domestic violence and child abuse are continuing to increase. Many families who are experiencing these difficulties seek both food and shelter assistance."

Evictions

An increase in the number of evictions was reported as a cause of homelessness in 20 percent, or five, of the cities -- Detroit, Nashville, New York City, San Antonio and San Francisco. Officials in New York City indicated that one-fifth of the homeless families housed by the City were evicted for non-payment of rent or overcrowding; another one-fifth were evicted by a primary tenant. In San Antonio "there is an increasing number of displaced persons who are evicted for non-payment of rent."

Other factors were also identified by the cities as contributing to the problem of homeless:

Los Angeles: "Inadequate public financial resources to support needed services has contributed to the problem."

New York City: "One third of the 4,500 families sheltered by the City lost their apartments because of fire or vacate orders."

San Francisco: "There has been a steady increase in the number of persons whose 'benefits' have expired (e.g., unemployment insurance) or temporarily been curtailed due to procedural problems."

San Francisco: "Many 'board and care' beds for the frail elderly and physically disabled have been lost because it is no longer profitable to provide those services."

Trenton: "The lack of preventive services, advocacy and support services for low-income people geared specifically toward their economic survival is a major cause of the problem of homelessness."

THE CAPACITY

The number of shelter beds increased in over half (56 percent) of the survey cities during 1986. The average increase was 15 percent, ranging from 4 percent in Trenton, 6 percent in Nashville, and 10 percent in Cleveland and Phoenix, to 17 percent in Boston and Portland, 20 percent in Kansas City, 25 percent in San Francisco and 40 percent in Los Angeles. In New York City the number of homeless families sheltered by the City increased by 20 percent to a total of 4,500 (with 16,300 family members); the number of single adults housed in the City's shelters increased by 26 percent, to a total of 9,500 individuals.

The number of shelter beds did not change in eight (32 percent) of the cities -- Denver, Hartford, Minneapolis, Norfolk, San Antonio, San Juan, Seattle and Yonkers. Three cities -- Charleston, New Orleans and Salt Lake City -- indicated a loss, by an average of 11 percent, in the number of shelter beds available to homeless people.

In all but one of the survey cities services other than emergency shelter have been established to assist homeless people. Health care, provided in 14 of the cities, was the service most frequently mentioned. Twelve of those cities received grants from the Health Care for the Homeless Program of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and Pew Memorial Trust. Two of the remaining cities qualified their answers: Salt Lake City indicated that the health care services available were "limited;" Minneapolis noted that medical "screening" was provided. Other services mentioned include:

- drop-in centers that serve homeless persons, in Boston, Denver, Los Angeles, Louisville, New Orleans, Philadelphia and San Francisco. In Nashville the Metro Council recently authorized $200,000 for the establishment of a day center for the homeless.

- programs that provide job training or placement, in Charleston, Kansas City, New York City, Norfolk, Phoenix, San Antonio, Seattle, and Yonkers.

- mental health and other support services, in Philadelphia, Phoenix and San Francisco. Philadelphia has established a "comprehensive system of long-term shelter facilities which include case management, housing referral and assistance, and rent advances.

Specialized mental health, housing and outreach are coordinated with other agencies and programs." San Francisco mentioned a structured living program for chronically mentally ill individuals.

- o money-management services, in San Francisco, New York City and Portland;
- o housing counseling and assistance with relocation, in Boston, Norfolk and San Antonio;
- o social services provided to SRO residents, in Chicago and San Francisco;
- o outreach services, in Boston, Denver, Nashville and San Francisco;
- o case management to assist homeless persons in accessing needed services, in Charleston, Denver, Hartford, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Trenton;
- o parenting education and other support services to families, in Kansas City, New Orleans, San Francisco and Yonkers;
- o an "emergency shelter hotline" in Denver;
- o a residential program for homeless victims of AIDS in San Francisco;
- o a "Home Visiting Head Start" program for homeless children in San Francisco;
- o the allocation of HUD Section 8 housing units specifically to homeless individuals in Phoenix;
- o a network of "warming centers" used in critical weather periods in Chicago; and
- o a rent-abatement program in Trenton to prevent homelessness resulting from evictions;

THE FUNDING

Nineteen (76 percent) of the survey cities reported that the city governments have used their funds -- either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants -- to support local shelters or other services specifically for homeless people. The funds come from a variety of sources:

- o Fifteen cities use locally generated revenues: Boston, Chicago, Detroit, New York City, Phoenix, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, Seattle, Trenton, Denver, Hartford, Los Angeles, Nashville, Philadelphia and Portland.

- Thirteen cities use state grants: Boston, Chicago, Detroit, Phoenix, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, Seattle, Trenton, Hartford, Los Angeles, Nashville, Philadelphia and Portland.

- Federal grants are used in 17 cities: Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Hartford, Los Angeles, Nashville, New York City, Norfolk, Phoenix, Portland, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, San Francisco, Seattle, Trenton. Of these:

  * Four cities -- Chicago, Nashville, New York City and Seattle -- have used General Revenue Sharing.

  * Community Development Block Grants are used by 12: Boston, Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Los Angeles, Louisville, Nashville, Phoenix, Portland, Salt Lake City, San Francisco and Seattle. New Orleans plans to use CDBG funds in 1987.

  * Nine cities -- Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Los Angeles, Nashville, Phoenix, Portland, Salt Lake City and Seattle -- have used the Community Services Block Grant.

  * The Emergency Food and Shelter Program, administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, is used by 15 cities to provide shelter and other services to homeless individuals: Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Detroit, Hartford, Los Angeles, Nashville, New York City, Norfolk, Portland, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, San Francisco, Seattle, and Trenton.

Among the other sources of funds listed by the cities are HUD Section 8, a Mayor's Trust for the Homeless, USA for Africa, a housing trust, and revenues generated by development exactments.

THE UNMET NEED

An average of 24 percent of the demand for emergency shelter in the survey cities goes unmet. Estimates of unmet need range from two to five percent in Philadelphia, 13 percent in Denver, and 20 percent in Norfolk and Yonkers, 40 percent in Los Angeles, to 45 percent in Seattle, 50 percent in Phoenix and Salt Lake City and 98 percent in San Juan. Four cities -- Minneapolis, New York City, Portland and San Antonio -- reported that all the need for shelter is being met. Boston officials explained why they could not provide a specific percentage: "This is a difficult number to estimate because a few shelters will allow homeless people to sleep on the floor even if they do not have enough beds. This provides flexibility in the number of people who can be sheltered from the cold on a given night."

Eighteen of the cities (72) percent reported that emergency shelters have to turn away people in need because of lack of resources. Chicago officials noted that "there are still more homeless people than shelter beds available" in the city. Officials in Los Angeles indicated that "almost every night" homeless people are turned away from shelters. An outdoor shelter was established in Phoenix to handle homeless people who could not

be accommodated in the city's indoor shelter. Both shelters, which have a total capacity of over 700, must turn away as many or more homeless individuals as they are able to serve, city officials reported. In San Juan "there are only 30 shelter beds to accommodate all of the homeless persons in a city with a population of approximately 432,000." In Seattle "the lack of space in shelters has become a severe problem." Yonkers officials point out that the private agencies and churches that operate the shelters "simply do not have enough resources available to handle the demand."

Several of the cities commented that a significant number of those being turned away are families with children:

> Boston: "Family shelters turn away up to 50 families per month because of a lack of rooms."
>
> Kansas City: "Sufficient family units have been unavailable at different times during the year. There was a 57 percent deficit in family rooms available during the first ten months of 1986, according to a local hotline's statistics. Families have been forced to stay with relatives, sleep in cars, abandoned buildings or, in some cases, split themselves into smaller units to be accepted by facilities which handle singles or smaller family units. Shelters have often expanded beyond preferred operating capacities to accommodate the demand in extreme weather conditions. Often this has meant sleeping as many as twice the normal capacity on a given night."
>
> Louisville: "The city has only 26 family units. For every one family that is served, two are turned away."
>
> Norfolk: "In instances where intact families need emergency shelter, the demand exceeds the supply."
>
> Phoenix: "Approximately half of the overall demand for emergency shelter goes unmet. For families, however, the number is even higher. There is only one shelter in the city, with a total capacity of 26 beds, which can house homeless families."
>
> Nashville: "According to a recent study by the Metropolitan Development Housing Agency Task Force on the Homeless, 'a comparison of the capacity and demand for spaces in shelters and transitional facilities reveals a large gap; approximately 255 individuals and 178-182 families are turned away from services each month.'"
>
> New Orleans: "There are no facilities that can accommodate intact families. In most cases, the families must split up in order to be sheltered."

Five of the seven cities that reported meeting the demand for emergency shelter qualified their answers. Although homeless individuals are not turned away in Salt Lake City "it sometimes takes a person a day or so to get placed in a facility." Networking systems have been established in Detroit and Portland to assist homeless persons who cannot be accommodated by a particular shelter in finding alternative emergency housing in the

community. Both New York City and Philadelphia have policies to provide shelter to all individuals in need who request assistance. Officials in Philadelphia note that "there are certainly 'spot' shortages of beds, but the sheiter system is ever expanding as more and more persons are housed in shelters for longer and longer periods of time."

Seventy-two percent of the survey cities identified families with children as a specific group within the homeless population for whom emergency shelter and other needed services are particularly lacking. Among them are Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Louisville, Phoenix, Seattle, Philadelphia, Portland, and Los Angeles. In discussing the shelter needs of homeless families, city officials said:

> Charleston: "There is a need for more family oriented shelters".
>
> Kansas City: "The emergency shelter system in Kansas City has responded adequately to the shelter needs of most groups. However, families with children have posed a particular problem. This is by far the most pressing concern with regard to the allocations of space. Hotline statistics for the first 10 months of 1986 reveal that of 1,570 family rooms needed, only 655 were available."
>
> Nashville: "More small-scale shelters are needed for families, with supportive services like day care (while parents seek jobs and housing) and transportation. We need alternatives to large-scale shelters with heterogeneous populations."
>
> Trenton: "Clearly, the largest group of the homeless are children alone or in families. Efforts to help children and families are expensive and time consuming. Municipal social service agencies in most cases can not legally or financially meet the needs of this group."
>
> Yonkers: "Families, because of their size, are the most most difficult to serve, especially since it is the largest growing group in the homeless population. Existing shelters were originally developed several years ago to address a different group of homeless people -- single men and women -- and have not been able to respond to demographic changes in the population because of lack of resources."

Twelve cities (48 percent) indicated that services needed to address the special problems of the homeless mentally ill are particularly lacking. They include Chicago, Denver, Hartford, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Nashville, Norfolk, Phoenix, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, San Francisco and Seattle. Officials in Chicago note that the chronically mentally ill (as well as families) "lack sufficient services. To serve these groups adequately, the City is attempting to create additional, appropriate shelters, extend social services, and lobby for additional state support for the chronically mentally ill."

Five cities -- Denver, Hartford, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, and Yonkers -- identified substance abusers as a group whose needs are not being met. San Francisco officials indicated that "there is a great need for more services for homeless persons with alcohol problems. The number of treatment beds has not kept pace with the growing number of homeless persons in

the shelters who have drinking problems. There is also a need for a program for 'dual diagnosed' homeless persons."

Services for homeless women were reported to be lacking in Los Angeles, San Francisco and Yonkers. Chicago, New Orleans and Phoenix cited the need for facilities that can accommodate disabled homeless individuals. Officials in Los Angeles and Portland, where a new 25-bed shelter for youths is expected to open shortly, indicated that emergency shelter and other services for homeless youths are particularly needed. Denver and Hartford reported a lack of facilities that serve single men. San Francisco officials cited the need for preventive services for all groups.

Boston indicated that "it would be difficult to categorize one group within the homeless population as particularly lacking services because each group has different unmet needs. There are currently shelters which serve each of these specialized groups; however, each group still lacks needed services."

THE OUTLOOK

Twenty one, or 84 percent, of the cities expect the demand for emergency shelter to increase in 1987. Three cities -- Boston, Denver and Minneapolis -- indicated that they expect the demand for shelter to stay the same. Boston officials note that "the demand for shelter will increase somewhat due to the increasing population in Boston, which has greatly strained the housing market. The City has encouraged affordable housing production and the creation of new shelter beds and transitional housing in an attmept to at least keep pace with the continuing need." Yonkers, the only city that anticipates that the demand will decrease, qualified its answer: "The demand will decrease if projected plans for construction initiatives with affordable housing proceed on a timely basis. If not, then the homeless population will increase."

Reasons given for the expected increase in the demand for emergency shelter include:

Charleston: "With cutbacks in social services continuing, our statistics lead us to expect significant increases in the demand for shelter. Reductions in federal programs for housing assistance may well put more people in the streets, thus increasing the problem."

Chicago: "There has been no significant improvement in the economic status of the city's poor and near poor."

Detroit: "Inadequate public assistance benefit levels, long-term unmployment, and high energy costs will contribute to the continuation and possibly a worsening of this problem."

Kansas City: "For all the reasons given as causes for homelessness, especially those which are economic in nature, coupled with a slow rate of development of affordable housing, the demand is not likely to decrease significantly."

Louisville: "Unless we address the need for affordable housing, employment and increased public assistance, our community will continue to see an increase in the homeless population."

Philadelphia: "Unless the causes of homelessness are addressed, the demand will continue at the present rate of increase. Currently, the homeless are being housed for long periods of time in the shelter system because of a lack of long-term solutions."

Portland: "We forsee no changes in the city's economic picture, which is very poor, and, therefore, expect the problem to keep growing."

San Francisco: "We do not expect to see any abatement in the causes of homelessness."

San Juan: "Homelessness will continue to increase due to the lack of services needed to address the problem, and to uncontrolled illegal immigration."

Salt Lake City: "The demand for emergency shelter has been increasing about 20 percent per year during recent years and there is as yet no sign that it is going to subside."

Trenton: "Low-income housing initiatives are not keeping pace with the demand. Many urban areas are financially ill-equipped to provide the extensive range of services needed."

CITY DATA ON HOMELESSNESS

CITY	PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN DEMAND FOR EMERGENCY SHELTER	PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN	PERCENTAGE COMPOSITION OF HOMELESS POPULATION						ARE PEOPLE TURNED AWAY?	
			FAMILIES	SINGLE MEN	SINGLE WOMEN	MENTALLY ILL	SUBSTANCE ABUSERS	WORKING	YES	NO
BOSTON	--	--	21	65	14	32	29	25/10[a]	x	
CHARLESTON	--	--	5	85	10	40	40	33	x	
CHICAGO	8	8	40	40	20	30	40	30	x	
CLEVELAND	8	13	25	50	25	20	6	8	x	
DENVER	20	15	20	45	37	35	10	--	x	
DETROIT	--	40	--	65	--	26	25	--		x[b]
HARTFORD	--	--	15	75	10	35	50	15	x	
KANSAS CITY	--	34	40	45	15	--	14	30	x	
LOS ANGELES	50	30	--	--	--	14	30	--	x	
LOUISVILLE	--	46	15	75	10	60	70	25	x	
MINNEAPOLIS	30	--	5	85	10	40	50	10		x
NASHVILLE	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	x	
NEW ORLEANS	25	25	10	77	13	33	--	--	x	
NEW YORK CITY	24	20	76	21	3	25	--	--		x
NORFOLK	10	20	15	75	10	10	5	5	x	
PHILADELPHIA	25	28	50	35	15	13	23	5		x
PHOENIX	25	25	20	70	10	25	20	10	x	
PORTLAND	10	10	52	27	10[c]	--	--	--		x
SALT LAKE CITY	20	29	20	70	10	45	--	23		x[b]
SAN ANTONIO	7	5	10	75	15	--	--	--		x
SAN FRANCISCO	15	20	20	47	30[d]	45	45	7	x	
SAN JUAN	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	x	
SEATTLE	25	30	35	55	10	40	40	30	x	
TRENTON	15	20	50	35	15	15	15	20	x	
YONKERS	15	15	50	25	25	2	2	30	x	

a. Twenty-five percent: single adults; ten percent: members of families.

b. Referral systems have been established to handle overflow.

c. Five percent of the homeless population are youths; four percent are couples without children; and two percent are elderly.

d. Three percent of the homeless population are adolescents without parents.

HOUSING

During 1986 the demand for assisted housing by low income households increased in all but three of the survey cities, by an average of 40 percent. It stayed the same in three cities, and decreased in none. The average wait for assisted housing in the survey cities is 18 months, and in over two-thirds of the cities waiting lists for assisted housing programs have been closed. Less than one-third of the eligible low-income households in the survey cities are currently being served by assisted housing. Over the last five years the safe, decent and affordable housing stock available to low and moderate-income households decreased in over half of the cities, increased in 29 percent and remained the same in 17 percent. With the decline in federally assisted housing programs, none of the survey cities expect to be able to meet rental housing needs.

THE DEMAND

The demand for assisted housing by low-income households increased in 88 percent of the survey cities during 1986. Three cities -- Norfolk, Phoenix and Trenton -- reported that it remained the same. No cities reported a decrease in demand. The average percent of the increase in demand was 40 percent, ranging from five percent in New Orleans and Portland and 10 percent in Louisville, Nashville and San Antonio to 300 percent in San Francisco.

The average wait for assisted housing from the time of application until assistance is received in the survey cities is 18 months. This ranges from one to two months in Detroit, three months in Minneapolis and four months in Denver to three or more years in Louisville and Philadelphia and five years in Boston. Chicago officials reported a 10-year wait for Section 8 certificates. New Orleans and Philadelphia noted, however, that the wait for emergency referrals is closer to three months.

Waiting lists for assisted housing programs have been closed in sixty-eight percent of the survey cities because they are so long. These cities are Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Hartford, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Louisville, Nashville, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, San Antonio, San Francisco, Seattle and Yonkers. Several cities, including Boston, Hartford, Portland, Phoenix, Seattle and Yonkers, close their waiting lists periodicially as the list gets too long. San Francisco officials noted that 1986 was the first year since 1981 that the Housing Authority accepted applications for Section 8 Certificates, and the first year since 1983 that applications were accepted for public housing units. San Francisco's waiting list closed again in October of 1986, however. Minneapolis, which is one of the eight cities in which applications are still being accepted, noted that it just began doing so.

THE CAPACITY

Across the survey cities, an average of 30 percent of eligible low-income households are served by assisted housing. This ranges from 10

percent in New York City, 12 percent in Kansas City and Los Angeles and 15 percent in Phoenix to 45 percent in Chicago and 70 percent in Boston and Nashville. In Seattle 70 percent of the elderly and 44 percent of the families are served. Boston officials noted: "Most low-income families cannot afford non-assisted housing in Boston today. Therefore, the 30 percent not being served are increasingly 'at risk.'"

Over half of the survey cities, 54 percent, reported that the safe, decent and affordable rental housing stock available to low and moderate-income households in their city had decreased over the last five years. These cities are Boston, Kansas City, Minneapolis, Nashville, New York City, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, San Francisco, Seattle, Trenton and Yonkers. The average amount of the decrease was 15 percent, ranging from one percent in Kansas City and four to five percent in Nashville to 30 percent in Philadelphia and Salt Lake City and 31 percent in San Francisco.

Seven cities, 28 percent, reported that the affordable housing stock available to low and moderate-income households had increased; four -- Charleston, Louisville, New Orleans and Portland -- reported that it had remained stable. Louisville officials noted, however, that "the demand for affordable housing has increased at a more rapid rate than the units available." In New Orleans "the number of units is the same, but the number of rental units has declined because only emergency repairs can be done."

City officials were asked why homeless individuals and families are unable to secure permanent housing in their cities. They gave two primary, and often connected, reasons: lack of income and lack of available, affordable housing. Citing lack of income were Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Cleveland, Kansas City, Nashville, Norfolk, Phoenix, Portland, San Antonio, San Francisco, San Juan and Yonkers. Lack of affordable housing was mentioned by Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Louisville, Nashville, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, Seattle and Trenton.

THE OUTLOOK

All 25 of the survey cities said that local housing programs will be unable to meet local housing needs, given the decline in federally assisted housing programs. Explaining this, city officials said:

> Boston: "The City of Boston increased its funding for all forms of low-income housing, from homeless shelters to the construction of new low-income family housing. We have also worked to implement 'linkage' and 'inclusionary zoning' programs to attract private funds for this important public purpose. We are unable, however, to keep up with rental housing needs because of the soaring cost of housing, the cutbacks in federal funds, and the need to devote resources to revitalizing HUD's existing 'at risk' units in Boston."
>
> Kansas City: "There are not enough subsidies; there is a lack of low-rent housing; and many sub-standard units are being condemned."

Los Angeles: "Demand far exceeds availability."

New Orleans: "The housing authority's budget is subsidized 50 percent by the federal government. The decline in federal assistance has made the housing authority unable to repair and maintain units. Funds are available only for emergency repair; none are available for preventive maintenance."

Norfolk: "The demand far exceeds the supply. Outside assistance from either the state or federal level will continue to be crucial."

Philadelphia: "The need is so great; persons may wait in a shelter for longer than a year. The burden just to shelter persons, let alone house them, is increasingly difficult each year. The amount of money lost from the federal government is so great it cannot be replaced locally."

Phoenix: "Federal housing programs currently help about 15 percent of the low-income people who need housing assistance. The decline in federal assistance will decrease the number of people who can be helped, while at the same time the population and need for housing assistance will grow. It is not anticipated that local housing programs will be able to replace federal assistance, let alone meet the housing need that federal funds never met."

Portland: There are "restrictions on bonding authority and new tax changes. No new housing for low income people is being built without Section 8."

Salt Lake City: "It is simply economically infeasible to expect the private sector to provide affordable low-cost housing without government assistance and subsidies."

San Antonio: "Due to cutbacks in federally assisted housing, new low-income housing is not being built."

San Francisco: "The reasons seem to be obvious. In California, the passage of Proposition 13 has handcuffed the ability of cities to generate revenue which would permit their additional involvement."

Trenton: "City resources are already severely strained by adjusting to cutbacks in other federal programs, such as general revenue sharing, urban development action grants and job training funds. It is not possible for city resources to adjust to all cutbacks."

CITY DATA ON HOUSING

CITY	ASSISTED HOUSING DEMAND IN 1986	AVERAGE WAIT IN MONTHS	STOPPED ACCEPTING APPLICATIONS YES	STOPPED ACCEPTING APPLICATIONS NO	PERCENT LOW INCOME HOUSEHOLDS SERVED	AFFORDABLE HOUSING STOCK IN LAST 5 YEARS
BOSTON	increased	60	x		70	decreased
CHARLESTON	increased	9-12	x		35	same
CHICAGO	increased	(a)	x		45	increased
CLEVELAND	increased	12	x		37	increased
DENVER	increased	4	x		--	increased
DETROIT	increased	1-2		x	--	increased
HARTFORD	increased	3-12	x		--	increased
KANSAS CITY	increased	6	x		12	decreased
LOS ANGELES	increased	18	x		12	increased
LOUISVILLE	increased	36	x		--	same
MINNEAPOLIS	increased	3		x	30	decreased
NASHVILLE	increased	3-36	x		70	decreased
NEW ORLEANS	increased	24(b)		x	--	same
NEW YORK CITY	increased	24		x	10	decreased
NORFOLK	same	8-12		x	--	decreased
PHILADELPHIA	increased	(c)	x		--	decreased
PHOENIX	same	24	x		15	increased
PORTLAND	increased	(d)	x		30	same
SALT LAKE CITY	increased	9		x	29	decreased
SAN ANTONIO	increased	(e)	x		10	decreased
SAN FRANCISCO	increased	30	x		--	decreased
SAN JUAN	increased	24-36		x	--	--
SEATTLE	--	5-24	x		(f)	decreased
TRENTON	same	6-12		x	--	decreased
YONKERS	increased	6	x		20	decreased

(a) Section 8: 10 years; Chicago Housing Authority: varies by development.
(b) emergencies: 3 months.
(c) normally: several years; emergencies: 3-6 months.
(d) elderly: 1-3 months; families: 6 months.
(e) public housing: 3 months; leased housing: 3 years.
(f) families: 44 percent; elderly: 70 percent.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Over two out of three of the survey cities reported that the number of poor people increased during 1986. At the same time, the unemployment situation improved in 10 cities, or 42 percent, remained the same in another ten, and worsened in four cities. While 14 cities reported that they had benefited from the national economic recovery, 21 said the recovery has not helped the hungry, the homeless or other poor people in their city. In the three cities where the economic recovery has helped the poor, the help has been indirect, through increased charitable giving and availability of services.

POVERTY

City officials reported that the number of poor people increased in 16 of the survey cities, or 70 percent. These cities are Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Los Angeles, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, New Orleans, Phoenix, Portland, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, San Juan and Seattle. Two cities, Hartford and Yonkers, cited decreases in the number of poor people; five said the number remained the same.

City officials identified several different indicators of an increase in the number of poor people. Most frequently cited were increased public assistance or food stamp caseloads, by Chicago, Detroit, Kansas City, Minneapolis, Phoenix and San Francisco. Increased demand for emergency food and shelter was cited by Charleston, Portland, Salt Lake City and Seattle. Other factors cited were increased numbers of unemployed persons, people seeking social services and evictions.

Three cities commented on how the composition of their poverty population is changing. "Phoenix continues to attract substantial numbers of unemployed individuals and families who are at least temporarily poor," according to officials from that city. Seattle officials cited the "continuing influx of refugees at an average rate of 200 per month." Nashville officials commented: "The poverty population seems to increase along with the general population, but its composition changes as some move in and out of poverty and welfare dependency."

Denver officials tied their city's increase in poverty to the employment situation: "The whole job situation as it relates to oil and gas, mining and high tech has decreased, in turn forcing these people to take jobs that others with less credentials might have been eligible for. It's a 'trickle down' effect. So much relates to lack of job skills and competitiveness."

The New Poor

In commenting on what has happened to the new poor during the last year, city officials primarily cited employment-related problems and the difficulty of the new poor in obtaining needed social services:

Detroit: "There are inadequate job opportunities and inadequate training and retraining programs to assist people in gaining employment. Additionally, many people are unaware of the resources which exist because current outreach efforts are either non-existent or inadequate."

Louisville: "It is difficult for them to find employment, and if they do it is usually at minimum wages."

Portland: "People who loose their job often cannot find work again."

Salt Lake City: "Many of the new poor are structurally unemployed and are, therefore, having a difficult time finding meaningful employment."

San Juan: The new poor are "basically suffering from lack of employment."

Norfolk: "The new poor are relying more on non-profit social and religious organizations for assistance."

New Orleans: "There are fewer and fewer services available, resulting in increases in mental health problems, as manifested by depression and mental disorders. Some of the new poor are homeless."

San Antonio: "Many families in this category have had to seek assistance from social service agencies for the first time in their lives."

The Working Poor

Many survey cities report that low wages coupled with the high cost of living force many of the working poor to require public assistance:

Phoenix: "High housing costs, the shortage of affordable day care, and the shortage of unskilled or low-skilled employment opportunities continue to aggrevate conditions and keep the working poor in poverty. Because their wages have been static and have not kept up with inflation, the working poor are really getting poorer."

Boston: "Although costs for housing and food have continued to rise in Boston, the wages have not kept pace. The preponderance of service industry jobs (21 percent of which pay below $10,000 per year) continues to put pressure on those holding the jobs."

Yonkers: "They are finding themselves being squeezed by a growing economy which is pushing up the cost of living far in excess of the rate of income of the working poor."

Los Angeles: "The minimum wage is the same; the cost of living is up."

San Juan: There has been "no adequate salary rate in respect to the increase in the cost of living."

New Orleans: "They are becoming poorer. Many have lost their jobs and are no longer the 'working poor.'"

Salt Lake City: "The working poor are becoming worse off and are more frequently seeking public assistance."

San Antonio: "A large percentage of persons in this category require some type of public assistance on a regular basis."

Detroit: "Perhaps a reexamination of the eligibility for public assistance to enable the working poor to obtain more support for their efforts is required. Additionally, we must look at more low-cost affordable housing, subsidized day care and educational or training opportunities."

The Chronic Poor

City officials commented on the low benefits available to the chronic poor, and their difficulty in breaking out of poverty:

Salt Lake City: "The chronic poor are much worse off because of the numerous cuts in social programs."

Detroit: "Increased benefit levels are imperative."

Boston: "Although welfare benefits are now court-ordered to be increased, the results have not been felt during this past year, and the situation for welfare-dependent families is particularly acute."

Kansas City: "This group continues to be victimized by their lack of skills, education, and resources necessary to break the cycle of poverty."

Louisville: "These individuals continue to move in a lower economic strata because they now are in competition with the new and working poor."

San Juan: There are "no real good opportunities for change of socio-economic class."

Poverty Case Studies

Officials in the survey cities were asked to provide a brief case study which describes the conditions faced by a family or individual in poverty in their city:

KANSAS CITY -- A SINGLE-PARENT FAMILY

"During the late fall, a single-parent family of four which was living in a dilapidated house without heat or water, came to our attention. The female head of the household could not seek better housing because she was without income or food stamps due to the state public assistance office's delay in processing her application for AFDC and food stamps. The same agency which was taking two months to process this application was also

threatening to remove her children because of her failure to provide suitable housing. The family has now moved to a house where the rent is only slightly less than the AFDC grant; therefore, the emergency will be a recurring one."

SALT LAKE CITY -- A TRANSIENT FAMILY

"A typical transient family in Salt Lake City comes in an automobile that breaks down. The family has no money and, therefore, seeks public assistance. In many cases it is possible to reunite them with friends or relatives who can help them. In a few cases they become employed and get back into the mainstream. In a lot of cases they become overwhelmed by their problems."

LOUISVILLE -- A WELFARE FAMILY

"In our community an eligible welfare family of four receives $246 in AFDC, $200 in food stamps and a medical card. It is nearly impossible to meet the basic needs of shelter, food and clothing, if the family does not receive a housing subsidy. In the State of Kentucky, a mother cannot receive AFDC if the father lives in the home. That is why there has been an increase in the need for family shelters."

NEW YORK CITY -- A WELFARE FAMILY

"A family of three in New York City with no income receives $5,964 in cash benefits. A food stamp bonus of $1,776 brings this family's total benefit to $7,740. This benefit is 89.4 percent of the poverty level."

NEW ORLEANS -- A HOMELESS FAMILY

"A homeless family must go from place to place to find resources, from month to month to make ends meet. The family must be separated to live in a shelter; there are no facilities that house intact families."

PORTLAND -- A HOMELESS FAMILY, A HOMELESS INDIVIDUAL

"A homeless family is housed for two weeks in a shelter (the usual maximum stay) and must leave. They move in for a while with relatives or friends, or must go back to the streets again; sometimes they must sleep in cars. They have no steady job that would allow them to break out of that cycle. A homeless individual spends most of his day waiting in lines for food, hanging out in the streets, and waiting to go back to the shelter at night."

SAN ANTONIO -- THE NEW POOR

"The most typical example is a family with one person working. That person is laid off due to economic reasons. The unemployed head of household is unable to find work, the family gets behind on all of their payments, and eventually loses their home, or gets evicted."

YONKERS -- TRAPPED ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

"They are finding it increasingly difficult to make ends meet, even if receiving public assistance. At the same time, they find themselves trapped because attempts to secure gainful employment produce less take-home income per month than remaining on public assistance."

NASHVILLE -- A FAMILY IN POVERTY

"There are frequent requests for assistance with basic necessities (food, rent, energy, clothing); frequent crises (the threat of eviction or cut-off of utilities); poor health and infrequent use of medical care; instability of housing and school-attendance; and hopelessness, depression and rage."

LOS ANGELES -- DISENFRANCHISED FROM SOCIETY

"A person or family is usually socially and economically disenfranchised from mainstream society. Frustration and disillusionment are prevalent."

UNEMPLOYMENT

Officials in the survey cities reported that the unemployment situation improved during 1986 in 10 cities (42 percent), and stayed the same in another 10. Cities reporting that the situation improved are Charleston, Kansas City, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, New York City, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Seattle and Yonkers. Four cities -- Denver, New Orleans, San Antonio, and San Juan -- reported that the unemployment situation worsened during 1986.

Four cities attributed the improved employment situation to economic development activities. Charleston officials said that it is "due to the opening of substantial new employment opportunities in retail and associated areas." In Kansas City "the metropolitan area is witnessing a development 'boom' which positively impacts employment figures with a corresponding increase in construction jobs." Nashville officials commented: "In a generally healthy economy, there is much construction, fast food trade, tourism, and other employment, along with high tech jobs." "Yonkers is enjoying a significant expansion in its local economy with projections indicating that growth should continue for the next several years."

Several cities where the unemployment situation improved identified problems, however:

- In Philadelphia, unemployment has "improved overall, but there has been no improvement for the marginally employable and unskilled; they are growing in numbers and being left behind."

- In San Francisco "there has been an increase in the number of persons who were formerly unemployed in part-time jobs at less than prevailing wages. In short, they have taken the only thing available to them."

- Louisville officials reported that "unemployment is decreasing, but the positions that these individuals apply for are ususally part-time and minimum wage."

Three cities commented on those who are not receiving unemployment compensation or are not counted in the official unemployment rate:

> Detroit: "While the official unemployment rate for the City of Detroit is about 11 percent, which is an improvement over previous years, the number of unemployed persons actually receiving benefits is less than 18 percent, as compared to about 70 percent in 1980-81."
>
> Portland: "The official statistics are not accurate; the homeless and other discouraged workers are not included in the figures."
>
> Los Angeles: "The official unemployment rate remained relatively constant; however, numerically, the number of unemployed and discouraged workers who dropped out of the labor market increased."

Commenting on 1987, officials in six cities -- Hartford, Louisville, Nashville, Philadelphia, Seattle and Yonkers -- expect the unemployment situation to improve. Seattle "expects work force growth of two to three percent per year through 1988, and there are projections that service sector jobs will increase by 26 percent by 1990." According to Yonkers officials: "The city is just now beginning to sustain a surge in economic growth which means that it is expected that actual solid growth will occur over the next several years."

Another six cities -- Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Kansas City, Los Angeles and San Juan -- expect the unemployment situation to worsen. Ten expect it to remain the same. Their projections are often based on local economic conditions and the impact of recent federal legislation:

> Kansas City: "There is likely to be a decrease in construction caused by recent tax reform legislation. This legislation may also affect other industrial growth by reducing business expansion and, therefore, the need to build new facilities. The local employment picture would be negatively affected in either case."
>
> Boston: "Uncertainty over the implications of tax reform on business may generally be a curb to economic growth. The cuts in tax exempt bonds will particularly affect our ability to link economic growth with economic justice."
>
> Los Angeles: "It is projected that the new federal immigration reform law will have an adverse impact on the local labor market. Los Angeles has the largest number of undocumented workers, and they represent a significant segment in the city's largest industries, such as manufacturing and services."
>
> Charleston: "No new projects are due to come on line in 1987."

New Orleans: "There are no anticipated economic development activities sufficiently large to warrant any significant improvement in the economic picture in the next year."

THE ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Officials in 14 of the survey cities (61 percent) reported that their city has benefited from the national economic recovery. Nine cities said their city had not benefited from the recovery. In contrast, officials in 21 of the survey cities -- 88 percent -- said that the economic recovery has not helped the hungry, the homeless or other poor people in their city; and in the three cities where the economic recovery has helped the poor, that help has primarily been indirect, through increased charitable giving and availability of services.

While many of the cities reported that they have benefited from the national economic recovery, they explained how the hungry, the homeless and other poor people have not:

San Francisco: "Generally, the business climate has improved. This improvement, however, has not been experienced by all segments of the population, with many individual situations becoming even worse than in previous years. For many, the gap is widening."

Trenton: "On the whole housing investments have jumped tremendously, high-tech office buildings are being built and costs are stable. Unfortunately, this does little to help low-income people, and the vulnerable mentally and physically handicapped in urban communities."

Detroit: "While the city has experienced growth, new construction and the attraction of industry and investment over the last five years, for those with no skills, for those with minimum educational background, and for those who have been displaced from jobs because of changing technology, there are not enough training programs and job opportunities. Jobs secured are often at substantially lower salaries than those previously held."

Kansas City: "The city as a whole has experienced a growth in new development created by business expansions and new private initiatives. This benefit will most directly affect the construction industry and skilled labor....The economic recovery has not helped the chronic poor. Economic recovery in general does not positively affect the marginally employed or the chronic poor."

Boston: "Boston's economic turnaround, to a large extent, preceded the 'national economic recovery.' In particular, federal investment in commercial, residential and industrial projects helped spur the city's economic resurgence....The increases in hunger and homelessness in recent years are evidence that the 'economic recovery' has had little perceived impact for the better. Rather, rising housing costs, waiting lists for public housing and the continuing lines at food pantries provide the best argument to the contrary."

Charleston: "Available dollars for capital investment and the amount being put into the military are the two principal reasons (that the city has benefited from the national economic recovery)....People who are homeless and hungry tend to run on a parallel course, not knowing or fitting into the jobs available."

Los Angeles: "The federal increase in defense expenditures has benefited the local economy. Moreover, with the new emphasis in international trade with the Pacific Rim sector, Los Angeles has become a major financial trade center....The shift in federal spending priorities and policy adversely impacts the poor. Expenditures for domestic social services such as housing, employment or education are relatively less, as defense spending increases."

Yonkers: "A number of nationwide industries in Yonkers have significantly expanded operations in the city because of the national economic recovery. Furthermore, we have found that with the economic growth, business executives are more inclined to take a risk on locating in an urban area....The economic recovery has simply widened the gap with the poor and made it even more difficult to move out of the poverty level."

Salt Lake City: "The transformation of our economy keeps increasing the number of structurally unemployed individuals....Improved conditions have primarily helped upper middle class individuals and above, while exacerbating the problems of the poor."

Several of the cities which indicated that neither their city nor the hungry, homeless or other poor people in the city has benefited from the economic recovery described their problems:

Louisville: "We see less unemployment, but the positions are usually part-time and without benefits. The statistics show that a family of four needs a wage earner that makes at least seven dollars per hour. ...Because families cannot meet their basic needs on their salary, we are seeing an increase in shelter needs."

San Antonio: "San Antonio has attracted much new industry, however, the City is growing at a fast pace. The recent oil industry collapse in Texas has also negatively impacted San Antonio....There have been many programs that have been initiated or expanded to address the problems of the needy in recent years. However, budget deficits at the federal, state and local levels have resulted in a reduction of services to these persons."

New Orleans: "The industrial make-up of the city is such that improvement in the national economy has had no impact in New Orleans. Oil and gas industries have remained in a depressed state."

Portland: "What economic recovery? If poor people have been helped it is because of the commitment and concern of many in the city, not because of any economic recovery."

Denver: "Our economy has relied on oil and gas, mining and high tech. It is a classic situation of the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer!...What economic recovery?"

Three cities reported that the economic recovery has helped the hungry, the homeless and other poor people, primarily by providing increased services and assistance. Seattle officials explained: "Because tax revenues are up the city government's allocation to survival services was increased by 115 percent (to $2.9 million) for 1987." Minneapolis officials report that they have benefited because of "low unemployment, enough tax base to provide services and much charitable giving." Finally, Nashville officials explained that "some of the benefits of recovery are very trickle down. The United Way has raised significantly more money. The churches and church people are giving more to the hungry and homeless in volunteer services, as well as in-kind food and cash assistance. Metro Government has increased appropriations for social services as its revenues from an expanding property tax base and from sales taxes have increased."

CITY DATA ON ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

CITY	POVERTY IN 1986	UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION IN 1986	UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION IN 1987	ECONOMIC RECOVERY HELPED CITY? YES	ECONOMIC RECOVERY HELPED CITY? NO	ECONOMIC RECOVERY HELPED POOR? YES	ECONOMIC RECOVERY HELPED POOR? NO
BOSTON	increased	same	same		x		x
CHARLESTON	increased	improved	same	x			x
CHICAGO	increased	same	worsen	--	--	--	--
CLEVELAND	same	same	same	--	--		x
DENVER	increased	worsened	worsen		x		x
DETROIT	increased	--	worsen	x			x
HARTFORD	decreased	same	improve		x		x
KANSAS CITY	same	improved	worsen	x			x
LOS ANGELES	increased	same	worsen	x			x
LOUISVILLE	increased	improved	improve		x		x
MINNEAPOLIS	increased	improved	same	x		x	
NASHVILLE	increased	improved	improve	x		x	
NEW ORLEANS	increased	worsened	same		x		x
NEW YORK CITY	--	improved	--	x			x
NORFOLK	same	same	same	x			x
PHILADELPHIA	--	improved	improve		x		x
PHOENIX	increased	same	same		x		x
PORTLAND	increased	same	--		x		x
SALT LAKE CITY	increased	same	same	x			x
SAN ANTONIO	same	worsened	--		x		x
SAN FRANCISCO	increased	improved	same	x			x
SAN JUAN	increased	worsened	worsen		x		x
SEATTLE	increased	improved	improve	x		x	
TRENTON	same	same	same	x			x
YONKERS	decreased	improved	improve	x			x

APPENDIX

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SURVEY CITIES

CITY	POPULATION	1979 POVERTY RATE	SEPTEMBER, 1985 UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	SEPTEMBER, 1986 UNEMPLOYMENT RATE
Boston	560,847	20.0%	4.8%	5.3%
Charleston	69,510	21.8	4.1	4.2
Chicago	2,997,155	20.3	9.9	8.7
Cleveland	558,869	2.1	13.1	12.1
Denver	505,563	13.7	5.0	6.6
Detroit	1,138,717	21.9	13.0	11.1
Hartford	136,334	25.2	6.1	5.6
Kansas City	445,222	13.2	5.0	5.6
Los Angeles	3,022,247	16.4	7.5	8.4
Louisville	293,531	19.3	5.9	5.3
Minneapolis	369,161	13.5	4.6	4.2
Nashville	455,252	12.6	3.7	4.3
New Orleans	564,561	26.4	11.4	10.6
New York City	7,086,096	20.0	8.1	6.6
Norfolk	266,874	20.7	4.8	4.0
Philadelphia	1,665,382	20.6	6.6	6.2
Phoenix	824,230	11.1	5.5	5.9
Portland	367,530	13.0	7.9	8.8
Salt Lake City	163,859	14.2	5.8	5.5
San Antonio	819,021	20.9	7.0	8.2
San Francisco	691,637	13.7	6.4	4.8
San Juan	522,700	47.4	15.1*	13.2*
Seattle	490,077	11.2	6.4	6.5
Trenton	92,124	21.2	7.0	6.6
Yonkers	192,342	9.8	5.1	4.2

*Unemployment rate is for metropolitan area.

City_____

TASK FORCE ON HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS
INFORMATION SHEET

Please complete the following survey and return it by November 26 to:

Lilia M. Reyes
U.S. Conference of Mayors
1620 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

A report will be published based on the responses to this survey. Experience has shown that such survey reports are more effective when they include examples of individual city data. If, however you want your city's answers to any of the questions held confidential, please specify those questions by number:_____

_____

==========

HUNGER

1. The Demand

Has the demand for emergency food assistance in your city ____increased, ____decreased or ____stayed the same during 1986? By what percentage? _____%.

Has the number of families with children requesting emergency food assistance in your city _____increased, _____decrease or _____stayed the same during 1986? By what percentage_____%.

Has the number of elderly persons requesting emergency food assistance in your city _____increased, _____decreased or _____stayed the same during 1986? By what percentage _____%.

2. The Capacity

Did the number of emergency food assistance facilities in your city ____increase, ____decrease or ____stay the same during 1986? By what percentage? _____%.

Are emergency food assistance facilities used for _____emergencies only or _____as steady source of food for a long time?

3. The Funding

During 1986, has your city government used its funds (either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants) to support local emergency food assistance efforts?____Yes____No
If yes, please specify:

____ Locally generated revenues
_____State grants
____ Federal grants
- _____ General Revenue Sharing
- _____ Community Development Block Grant
- _____ Community Services Block Grant
- _____ Emergency Food and Shelter Program (FEMA)
- _____ Other _____

4. The Unmet Need

Please estimate the percent of the demand for emergency food assistance in your city which goes unmet. _____%.

Do emergency food assistance facilities in your city have to turn away people in need because of lack of resources?
____ Yes ____No Please explain.

5. The Causes

What are the main causes of the problem of hunger in your city?

6. The Outlook

Do you expect the demand for emergency food assistance in your city to ____increase, ____decrease, or ____stay the same during 1987? Please explain.

HOMELESSNESS

7. The Demand

Has the demand for emergency shelter in your city ____increased, ____decreased or ____stayed the same during 1986? By what percentage? ____%.

Has the number of families with children requesting emergency shelter _____increased, _____decreased or _____stayed the same during 1986? By what percentage? _____%.

What percentage of your city's homeless population are:
Families with children_____% Chronically mentally ill_____%
Single men _____% Substance Abusers _____%
Single women _____% Working (full or part-time)_____%

Have the characteristics of the homeless population in your city changed in the last few years? _____Yes ____No
Please explain.

8. The Capacity

Did the number of shelter beds in your city ____increase, _____decrease or _____stay the same during 1986. By what percentage? _____%.

What services other than emergency shelters have been specifically established in your city to assist homeless people?

9. The Funding

Is your city government using its funds (either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants) to support local shelters or other services specifically for homeless people? ____Yes ____No

If yes, please specify:

____ Locally generated revenues
____ State grants
____ Federal grants
- ____General Revenue Sharing
- ____Community Development Block Grant
- ____Community Services Block Grant
- ____Emergency Food and Shelter Program (FEMA)
- ____Other _____
  _____

10. The Unmet Need

Do emergency shelters in your city have to turn away people in need because of lack of resources? ____Yes ____No

Please explain.

Please estimate the percent of the demand for emergency shelter in your city which goes unmet. _____%

Are there specific groups within the homeless population (e.g., families with children, single women, chronically mentally ill persons) for whom emergency shelter or other needed services are particularly lacking in your city? Please explain.

11. The Causes
What are the main causes of the problem of homelessness in your city?

12. The Outlook
Do you expect the demand for emergency shelter in your city to ____increase, ____decrease or ____stay the same during 1987? Please explain.

HOUSING

13. The Demand
During 1986, did the demand for assisted housing for low income families in your city ____increase, ____decrease or ____stay the same? By what percentage? ____%.

What is the average wait in months in your city from the time of application for assisted housing until an applicant actually receives assistance? ____months.

Have you stopped accepting applications for any assisted housing programs in your city due to the execessive length of the waiting list? ____Yes ____No. If yes, when?_____

14. The Capacity
Please estimate the percentage of eligible low income households in your city currently being served by assisted housing. ____%.

Over the last five years has the safe, decent and affordable rental housing stock available to low and moderate-income households in your city ____increased, ____decreased or ____ remained stable? By what percentage? ____%.

Given the decline in federally assisted housing programs, will local housing programs be able to meet rental housing needs in your city? ____Yes ____No. Please explain.

15. The Unmet Need

Please estimate the percentage of your city's shelter clients' (single adults and families) whose last residence was a rental unit?

Single adults _____%

Families _____%

Why were they unable to remain in that rental unit?

Why are homeless individuals and families unable to secure permanent housing in your city?

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

16. Poverty

Do you estimate that the number of poor people in your city _____increased, _____decreased or ____stayed the same during 1986? What are the indicators of any increase or decrease in the number?

What has happened in your city during the last year to:
the new poor?

the working poor?

the chronic poor?

Describe the conditions faced by a real or hypothetical family or individual in poverty in your city?

17. Employment

Did the unemployment situation ____improve, ____worsen or ____stay the same in your city during 1986? Please explain.

Do you expect the unemployment situation in your city to ____improve ____worsen or _____stay the same during 1987? Please explain.

18. The Economic Recovery

Has your city benefited from the national economic recovery? ____Yes ____No. Please explain

Has the economic recovery helped the hungry, the homeless and other poor people in your city? ____Yes ____No Please explain.

==========

Person completing form:

Name _____

Title _____

Agency _____

Address _____

_____

Telephone (____) _____

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

1620 EYE STREET, NORTHWEST
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
TELEPHONE (202) 293-7330

TASK FORCE ON HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS

Raymond L. Flynn, Boston
Chair

Federico Pena, Denver
Vice Chair

Jerry Abramson, Louisville
Marion S. Barry, Jr., Washington, D.C.
Sidney J. Barthelemy, New Orleans
Richard Berkley, Kansas City
Tom Bradley, Los Angeles
Henry Cisneros, San Antonio
J.E. "Bud" Clark, Portland
Baltasar Corrada del Rio, San Juan
Palmer DePaulis, Salt Lake City
Dianne Feinstein, San Francisco
Donald Fraser, Minneapolis
Richard Fulton, Nashville
Terry Goddard, Phoenix
W. Wilson Goode, Philadelphia
Arthur J. Holland, Trenton
Ed Koch, New York City
George Latimer, St. Paul
Joseph A. Leafe, Norfolk
Angelo R. Martinelli, Yonkers
Thirman L. Milner, Hartford
Joseph P. Riley, Charleston
Charles Royer, Seattle
Xavier Suarez, Miami
George V. Voinovich, Cleveland
Harold Washington, Chicago
Coleman A. Young, Detroit